

the recognition of, and equity for, the Merchant Marines of World War II should be one of them.

[From the Pittsburgh Post Gazette]

WW II'S UNSUNG HEROES

(By Dave Budinger)

When troop ships came home at the close of World War II, disgorging thousands of GI's onto docks and quays of America's seaports, they were met with fireboat whistles, cheering crowds, bands and victory parades.

When scruffy, lightly armed cargo ships of the U.S. Merchant Marine would steam into harbor at war's end, they were greeted by indifferent work tugs and nudged up against empty piers. No whistles, no cheers, no "Johnny Comes Marching Home" for their war-weary crews.

And it's sort of been that way ever since, say the almost-ancient mariners who today spice retirement by gathering at restaurants to swap war stories and take potshots at a government that still regards them as second-class.

Their thoughts are particularly poignant during Memorial Day week when flags fly and the country takes special note of its war heroes.

"Our destiny seems to be to let people know we weren't a bunch of draft dodgers," said Henry Huminski of Carrick, a retired ship's master and member of the 90-member McKeesport-based Mon Valley Chapter of the U.S. Merchant Marine Veterans.

Memorial Day observances honor the soldiers, sailors, Marines and airmen who gave their lives for their country. Homage has been slight, however, for the merchant mariners who died by the thousands in the South Pacific and on the infamous North Atlantic convoy routes that fed U.S. industrial might into the war against Germany.

After the war, GI veterans had the VFW and American Legion. They got the GI Bill, bonuses, insurance, help with housing, access to veterans hospitals and many other benefits. The 200,000 returning mariners got nothing—not even a free drink at the veterans clubs.

"We felt the deep division, compared to how the GIs were treated," Huminski said.

Left out of Memorial Day, the merchant sailors adopted little-known Maritime Day as their day of remembrance. Proclaimed by Congress in 1933, Maritime Day was set aside to commemorate the first transoceanic crossing by an American steam-powered vessel.

President Franklin Roosevelt, in one of his final proclamations, called upon the country to recognize the Merchant Marine war effort on Maritime Day, May 22, 1945. Since then, May 22 has become a traditional day to honor sailors from all the maritime services who were lost at sea.

As it has for several years, the Mon Valley Chapter organized a memorial service held Friday at Riverfront Park in Elizabeth.

It wasn't until 1988 that Congress granted veteran status and GI Bill rights to World War II mariners. "Too late for a lot of guys," Huminski huffed.

And even that measure fell short, the mariners say. Veteran status was applied to those who served in the Merchant Marine between Dec. 7, 1941, and Aug. 15, 1945. But veterans say civilian sailors were killed even in the waning weeks of the war, and want the cutoff point extended to Dec. 31, 1946.

Still, it was a step toward recognition as a bona fide arm of military service that the Merchant Marine seeks.

The reason for the Merchant Marine's unsettled status is that it was not quite military, but not entirely civilian. A merchant mariner in wartime was a hybrid. Although

recruited by the U.S. War Shipping Administration and trained by the Coast Guard at government-funded installations, they sailed on privately owned ships under contract to the government, and were paid by the ships' owners.

They were in most respects civilians, except for the fact they bled and died just like the people who wore the uniforms.

Under attack, they would often struggle side-by-side with Naval Armed Guard crews that manned the light armament aboard most of the merchant vessels. Mariners passed ammunition and sometimes took over gunposts when a Navy man fell.

When the war ended in 1945, 733 American cargo ships had been sunk in the European and Pacific theaters. More than 6,000 civilian sailors perished, including 57 from Western Pennsylvania. Another 11,000 were wounded and 604 were prisoners of war.

Early in the war, German U-boats sank two of every 12 ships that left U.S. ports. One convoy on a run from New York to England was hit by a U-boat wolfpack off Greenland and lost 22 of its 63 ships. Only a fog that blew in saved the rest of the convoy.

Huminski, 79, who sailed all the North Atlantic convoy routes including the treacherous Murmansk Run to Russia, was one of the lucky ones.

"I was never torpedoed. A lot of my friends were, but none of my ships were hit," he said.

Early in the war, German U-boats were ravaging the East Coast, sinking large numbers of unprotected vessels within sight of land. When his ship would set out from New York, "there was oil everywhere. You could see the flares on the horizon from ships burning at night," Huminski said.

"In the first four months, we lost more shipping tonnage than we lost at Pearl Harbor."

The average seaman was unaware of the heavy losses at sea.

"Everything was censored; complete secrecy. We didn't know what was going on, that so many ships were being sunk."

Huminski, a Depression era product and oldest son of a German-Polish family of 13 brothers and sisters, was in most respects typical of Pittsburgh recruits who signed up with the Merchant Marine.

He wanted to flee a crowded Hill District home and a stultifying job at Mesta Machine. He tried the Army but was rejected because of a jaw problem. "They called it malocclusion. I had a bad bite. I don't think they paid much attention to that kind of thing later in the war."

The day after Pearl Harbor, he signed on with the Merchant Marine. He left home Christmas Eve bound for the U.S. Maritime Training Center at Sheepshead Bay, N.Y. Except for one trip to Lake Erie when he was a youngster, Huminski had never seen a body of water larger than the three rivers. But he was excited about sailing.

"We were all so gung-ho back then. We were young. We didn't know what was ahead."

Unlike most of his Western Pennsylvania companions, Huminski stayed at sea after the war. He made the Merchant Marine a career, sailing 44 different ships, visiting 124 seaports and rising to ship's master, or captain, before retiring in 1981. The ships he crewed hauled "everything from ammo to horses and cows," and he served during the Korean and Vietnam wars. He estimates he spent 23½ years of his 40-year career on water.

More typical of Pittsburgh area Merchant Marine veterans is Henry Kazmierski of Clairton, who returned home after the war, married a local lass and raised a family while working at USSteel's Clairton Works.

Retiring in 1981 after 42 years in the mill, he's a regular at the monthly luncheon gatherings of the Mon Valley Chapter at the Old Country Inn Buffet in the Southland Shopping Center.

Not as lucky as Huminski in the North Atlantic, he can describe vividly the day his ship was torpedoed and sunk in the Barents Sea off the coast of Norway on the Murmansk Run.

It was a bitterly cold January day in 1944 aboard one of the new Liberty ships, the SS Penelope Barker. Kazmierski was standing his watch in the wheelhouse about 8:15 p.m. One of the 20 ships in the convoy had already been sunk, and the convoy had been under air attack during the day. Penelope's crew of 46 was on edge. Still, there was no warning when two torpedoes slammed into the side of the ship.

"I heard something hit, and I grabbed the wheelpost to stay up. The ship heeled to starboard."

He struggled out of the wheelhouse to the port side. "There was a tangled mess of lifeboats. I knew that wasn't going to work. I went to starboard. The water was coming up fast. I jumped over the side."

He gauged his jump to land close to a lifeboat already in the water.

"I went under. The water was icy cold. . . . I knew I couldn't last long."

His lifejacket popped him up just yards from the boat, and his shipmates quickly hauled him in.

The Penelope sank in less than 10 minutes. Had it been carrying ammunition instead of general cargo, it would have blown apart with the torpedoes' impact. As it was, 10 men went down with the ship.

Despite the close call, he was eager to get back to sea after 30 days "survivor's leave" at home.

"I never really saw anybody afraid out there. You get used to it," said Kazmierski, 78 who survived 11 crossings on the Murmansk Run.

"We'd just tell [the new guys] to 'Stand on your tiptoes and wait for somebody to pick you up' if you got sunk. You had to have some humor out there."

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CONVENTION CENTER AND SPORTS ARENA AUTHORIZATION ACT AMENDMENTS

SPEECH OF

HON. THOMAS M. DAVIS

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 30, 1998

Mr. DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, due to the time at which the House considered H.R. 4237 under unanimous consent procedures, the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight was unable to file the committee report on the bill. I am therefore entering the committee report as prepared into the RECORD at this time:

The Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, to whom was referred the bill (H.R. 4237) to amend the District of Columbia convention center and sports arena authorization act of 1995 to revise the revenues and activities covered under such act, and for other purposes, having considered the same, reports favorably thereon without amendment and recommends that the bill do pass.

I. BACKGROUND AND NEED FOR THE LEGISLATION

A. BACKGROUND

As noted by the Committee in the 104th Congress, the current Convention Center was

completed in 1982, at 9th and H Streets, N.W., and is widely considered too small to accommodate the largest and most financially attractive conventions. Over time, it is estimated that the situation will only become worse. The District of Columbia's existing Washington Convention Center is now only the 30th largest in the country and can accommodate 55% of national conventions and exhibition shows.

The inability of the Washington Convention Center to host so many events is unfortunate not only for the local economy, but also for the organizations and exhibitors who can no longer have the Nation's Capital on their regular schedule of meeting sites. In 1993, the Washington Convention Center generated \$656 million in spending from its activities. In 1995, that spending dipped to approximately \$558 million. The serious blow to the District's economy caused by the slowdown in activity at the Convention Center is obvious and needs to be reversed. A new, state-of-the-art Washington Convention Center of the appropriate size and technology to host 90% of the national level conventions and shows will generate up to \$1.5 billion of spending in the District of Columbia. Obviously, such increased economic activity will generate considerable additional revenues that cannot otherwise be used by the District.

In order to gain these economic benefits, the City needed to find a way to finance a new convention facility. It was clear to everyone that the City's general fund could not afford to continue to pay the operating subsidy for the current convention center or the up-front costs for a new one. As part of an effort to address this problem, the City Council enacted the Washington Convention Center Authority Act of 1994 (DC Law 10-188). This act established a special convention center tax. It took effect on October 13, 1994. This tax was composed of a fixed percentage of several pre-existing taxes. The convention center tax is a dedicated tax which the City places in a "lock-box" escrow account. It can be used only to pay the operating subsidy for the current convention center and for expenses associated with the development and construction of a new facility. In the same Act, the City Council created the Washington Convention Center Authority (WCCA). The WCCA is a corporate body with a legal existence separate from the City government. Because of the independent status of the WCCA, its self supporting revenue stream, and legal accountability, its spending is not subject to an annual appropriation. Although it has the power to issue bonds, the debt thereby created is not general obligation debt. The WCCA is governed by a nine member Board of Directors. The District's Chief Financial Officer and the Director of Tourism are ex-officio, voting members of the board. The remaining seven members, one from the tourism industry and another from organized labor, are appointed by the Mayor with the advice and consent of the Council. The Directors are responsible for managing the current convention center; developing plans for a new convention center; managing the new facility; and appointing a general manager for the convention center. The Board is empowered to develop a personnel system for convention center employees.

On July 12, 1995, the Subcommittee on the District of Columbia held a hearing on H.R. 1862, the District of Columbia Convention Center Preconstruction Act of 1995. At the July 12, 1995 hearing the Subcommittee also reviewed legislation authorizing the City to finance and pay its part of the costs associated with the construction of a new sports arena. That facility, now known as the MCI Center at Gallery Place, opened on time and

has been a spectacular success. Following the July 12, 1995 hearing, the legislation involving the sports arena and the legislation involving the Convention Center were combined into a new single piece of legislation, H.R. 2108 (P.L. 104-28), which authorized the WCCA to expend revenues for the operation and maintenance of the existing Washington Convention Center and for preconstruction activities relating to a new convention center in the District of Columbia.

The linkage of the legislation for the MCI Center and the Convention Center was more than a matter of convenience. It reflected the Committee's belief that together they were two of the most important economic generators in the entire region. The legislation was strongly supported by the entire Washington Metropolitan regional congressional delegation. In 1995, a new convention center was still in its initial planning stages. It needed and received congressional authority to permit already collected taxes dedicated to this project to be used in order to proceed to the planning and development stage. In 1996, a newly-formed Washington Convention Center Authority began actively to investigate construction of a new facility.

The WCCA has worked over the past four years to develop a project that will meet the economic development needs of the District of Columbia, the requirements of the community and the needs of the hospitality industry.

The regulatory process for approval of the new convention center has been key to the development of the project. WCCA has proceeded in accord with the statutory requirements for Federal and public involvement, notification of activities via the Federal Register and community newspapers, and in coordination with Federal and local agencies. In addition, over an eighteen month period, WCCA conducted over 100 public hearings with DC Advisory Neighborhood Commissions, community leaders, organizations and churches to discuss the progress and to provide the community an opportunity to express their views. The National Capital Planning Commission (NCPC) conducted six public hearings and the DC City Council conducted five public hearings. This process involved participation from the NCPC, the State Historic Preservation Office, Commission on Fine Arts, the National Environmental Protection Agency, the Historic Preservation Review Board, the Redevelopment Land Agency, and the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority. This process included the design, location, physical program, neighborhood mitigation, environmental, historical, and transportation issues. The Environmental Impact Statement process alone, was approximately an eighteen month activity which involved written public comments, public hearings and meetings, reviewing agency input and comments that resulted in a final document with mitigation measures for the environmental impacts from the construction of the new convention center.

The development of the new convention center process was initiated by the private sector in partnership with the District of Columbia. The private sector financed the original feasibility study, assisted in the drafting of the financing legislation, and requested that taxes be imposed upon hotels and restaurants which provided the financing framework of the plan.

B. NEED FOR LEGISLATION

The Committee has followed efforts to build a new Convention Center in downtown Washington with great interest. At this time additional congressional approval is necessary before construction on the new facility may begin. H.R. 2108 (P.L. 104-28) ex-

pressively did not authorize the financing or the construction of a new convention center. In order for the City to proceed beyond the planning and design phase, explicit, affirmative congressional action is necessary.

The Federal role in this project is very narrow. Here, Congressional action is necessary for the convention center project to move beyond the pre-construction stage. This legislation, H.R. 4237, authorizes the WCCA to begin financing (the issuance of bonds up to \$650 million) and construction of a new Washington Convention Center and waives the 30-day waiting period for DC Council Act 12-402 to go into effect.

II. LEGISLATION AND COMMITTEE ACTIONS

On July 16, 1998, Delegate Norton introduced H.R. 4237. H.R. 4237 was cosponsored by Chairman Thomas M. Davis, Mrs. Morella, Mr. Moran of Virginia, and Mr. Wynn. It was referred to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

The Subcommittee on the District of Columbia held a hearing on July 15, 1998. The bill was polled by the Subcommittee on the District of Columbia and marked-up by the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight on July 23, 1998. There were no amendments offered. The bill was favorably reported to the House by a unanimous vote.

III. COMMITTEE HEARINGS AND WRITTEN TESTIMONY

On Wednesday, July 15, 1998, the Subcommittee on the District of Columbia, of the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, met pursuant to notice. The purpose of the hearing was to review the financing package for a new Washington Convention Center.

Chairman Thomas M. Davis of Virginia stated at the opening of the hearing that a new convention center was important for the economic and cultural well being not only of our Nation's Capital but for the entire Washington metropolitan region. He emphasized the cooperative nature of the project and the close and continued oversight by the DC Financial Control Board of the project. He called specific attention to the narrow scope of the Congressional role in the development of a new Washington Convention Center. Ranking Member Norton, who introduced the legislation, stressed the importance of her legislation to the City's economic recovery and future vitality. Subcommittee Vice-Chair Morella and Representative Moran of Virginia also stressed their support for the economic and cultural benefits of the project for the entire metropolitan region.

The first panel consisted of witnesses from the Government of the District of Columbia and the Washington Convention Center Authority. Each witness expressed strong support for the project. Mayor Marion Barry focused on the economic benefits of the project for residents. Financial Control Board Chairman Andrew Brimmer stressed that the Authority had thoroughly reviewed and then unanimously approved the new Washington Convention Center project. He stated that the Authority was confident that the project would stay within budget and that the financing package was fiscally sound and in the best interests of the City. He also stated that in granting its approval, the Authority gave serious consideration to concerns expressed by various groups, including the Committee of 100, a community land use planning organization. Dr. Brimmer also emphasized that the project is one of the most important such projects ever to be undertaken by the government of the District of Columbia and that the Authority would continue its oversight role as the project developed. City Council Chair Linda Cropp and Council member Charlene Drew Jarvis testified in support of the importance of the

project to the future of the City and as to the role the Council played in the enactment of DC Act 12-402. President and CEO of Host Marriott Corporation and WCCA Chairman Terence Golden testified as to the need for a new facility and to the fact that the project has been designed to meet the needs of WCCA's target market, which consists of professional associations, corporate conventions, and international meetings. He reviewed the complex approval process that the project has cleared and the significance of the total economic output of the facility. He stated that by the fifth year of operation, the region as a whole is expected to realize as much as \$1.4 billion in total output from a new Washington Convention Center and 17,589 full and part time jobs. Mr. Golden emphasized that the construction management contract has been structured in such a way as to encourage cost savings and that any construction cost overruns would be borne by the Construction Manager. He testified that the total cost for the entire project is \$650 million, inclusive of the guaranteed maximum price (GMP). The WCCA budget also anticipates that improvements to the Mount Vernon Metro Station (\$25 million) and some off-site utility relocation costs (\$10 million) above the \$650 million will be funded through Congressional appropriations or Federal grants.

The second panel was comprised of Gloria L. Jarmon, Director, Health, Education, and Human Services Accounting and Financial Management Issues of the General Accounting Office; and Rick Hendricks, Director, Property Development Division, Public Buildings Service, National Capital Region of the General Services Administration. Ms. Jarmon testified that GAO had identified approximately \$58 million in related expenses above the WCCA total project budget of \$650 million. She testified that this amount above the \$650 million included costs that WCCA has allocated to industry vendor contracts (\$17 million) and Federal appropriations or grants for metro and infrastructure improvements (\$35 million). Ms. Jarmon stated that GAO's audit determined that WCCA's financing stream is a conservative plan relative to estimates provided by management consultants and the District, and to GAO's evaluation of trends in tax collections and the national and local economic outlook. Mr. Hendricks testified that GSA assisted in the development of WCCA's contracting methodology and that GSA finds the proposed project contract to be appropriate. He stated that the contract appears to have a high probability of being completed within budget and on schedule and that it establishes a reasonable allocation of risks. Mr. Hendricks also stated that the GAO identified costs above WCCA's \$650 million budget were handled in an acceptable manner in accord with convention/exhibition industry practice.

IV. EXPLANATION OF THE BILL

A. OVERVIEW

To amend the District of Columbia Convention Center and Sports Arena Authorization Act of 1995 to revise the revenues and activities covered under such Act, and for other purposes.

B. SECTION BY SECTION ANALYSIS

Section 1. Revenues and Activities Covered Under District of Columbia Convention Center and Sports Arena Act of 1995

Subsection (a) waives restrictions on the Washington Convention Center Authority with respect to the expenditure or obligation of any revenues for the financing of the new Washington Convention Center.

Subsection (b) sets forth the rule of construction regarding revenue bond require-

ments under the District of Columbia Home Rule Act.

Section 2. Waiver of Congressional Review of Washington Convention Center Authority Financing Amendment Act of 1998

This section waives the 30-day waiting period required for City Council Acts to take effect.

V. COMPLIANCE WITH RULE XI

Pursuant to rule XI, 2(l)(3)(A), of the Rules of the House of Representatives, under the authority of rule X, clause 2(b)(1) and clause 3(f), the results and findings from those oversight activities follow.

A. RECOMMENDATIONS

1. New convention center

The Committee notes that the Federal role in this project is narrow. In 1995, the Congress and the President enacted legislation which enabled the District of Columbia and the Washington Convention Center Authority (WCCA) to go forward with its part of the costs associated with the development of both the MCI Center at Gallery Place and to begin consideration and pre-construction activities for a new convention center. The MCI Center has proven to be a spectacular success, and the Committee is proud of the role it played in making that project possible.

The Committee commends the hard work done by the WCCA, City Council, Control Board, the National Capital Planning Commission (NCP), and community leaders to move the project one step closer to completion. Under ideal circumstances planning and construction of a convention center marks an important, new phase in the life of a metropolitan region. Three years ago, when the Committee started down this road, it was not the best of times for the Nation's Capital. Today, things are different. Not only have we made substantial progress in restoring economic stability and prosperity to the City, the Committee is convinced that projects such as the MCI Center itself has been a positive element in the City's continuing recovery. The MCI Center is a dynamic attraction in the center of the City. The Committee believes that a new Convention Center will only enhance the economic and cultural renaissance of downtown Washington.

The Committee expects the continued oversight of the WCCA project by the Control Board and GAO to ensure that financed project costs do not exceed \$650 million.

B. FINDINGS

The Committee recognizes the new convention center as being absolutely essential to the revitalization of the District's economy. After years of planning and preliminary review, local officials have decided to proceed with construction of a bigger and better convention center north of Mount Vernon Square.

The work of the General Accounting Office and the General Services Administration has been invaluable to the work of the Subcommittee on the District of Columbia. With out the many long hours of hard work the GAO audit team invested in its investigation of these projects and without the guidance and review provided by the GSA project team, Congress would not have the confidence to permit the City to move forward with this project. The Committee commends all parts of the District government on having worked together so constructively. The Financial Responsibility and Management Assistance Authority is empowered to approve or disapprove all City borrowing. They must sign off on the financial package, and after reviewing information from both proponents and opponents of the project they

have unanimously approved the project. The Control Board has in effect reported to Congress that all aspects of the project, including borrowing and costs, are compatible with the best interests of the City. This judgment has great credibility with the Committee.

VI. BUDGET ANALYSIS AND PROJECTIONS

This Act provides for no new authorization or budget authority or tax expenditures. Consequently, the provisions of section 308(a)(1) of the Congressional Budget Act are not applicable.

VII. COST ESTIMATE OF THE CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE

U.S. CONGRESS
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE
Washington, DC, July 30, 1998.

Hon. DAN BURTON,
Chairman, Committee on Government Reform and Oversight,

U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, DC

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The Congressional Budget Office has prepared the enclosed cost estimate for H.R. 4237, a bill to amend the District of Columbia Convention Center and Sports Arena Authorization Act of 1995 to revise the revenues and activities covered under such act, and for other purposes.

If you wish further details on this estimate, we will be pleased to provide them. The CBO staff contact is John R. Righter, who can be reached at 226-2860.

Sincerely,

JUNE E. O'NEILL,

Director.

Enclosure.

CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE COST
ESTIMATE—H.R. 4237

H.R. 4237 would authorize the Washington Convention Center Authority to issue revenue bonds to finance the cost of constructing a new convention center in the District of Columbia. The Joint Committee on Taxation estimates that the bill would not effect governmental receipts. In addition, CBO estimates that the bill would have no impact on federal spending. Thus, pay-as-you-go procedures would not apply to the bill. H.R. 4237 contains no intergovernmental or private-sector mandates as defined in the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act and would impose no costs on state, local, or tribal governments.

The CBO staff contact is John R. Righter, who can be reached at 226-2860. This estimate was approved by Robert A. Sunshine, Deputy Assistant Director for Budget Analysis.

VIII. SPECIFIC CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY FOR THIS LEGISLATION

Clauses 1 and 18 of Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution grant Congress the power to enact this law.

IX. COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

On July 23, 1998, a quorum being present, the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight adopted and ordered the bill favorably reported by voice vote.

X. CONGRESSIONAL ACCOUNTABILITY ACT; PUBLIC LAW 104-1; SECTION 102(b)(3)

The Committee finds that the legislation does not relate to the terms and conditions of employment or access to public services or accommodations within the meaning of section 102(b)(3) of the Congressional Accountability Act (PL 104-4).

XI. UNFUNDED MANDATES REFORM ACT; PUBLIC LAW 104-4, SECTION 423

The Committee finds that the legislation does not impose any Federal mandates within the meaning of section 423 of the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act (PL 104-4).

XII. FEDERAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
ACT (5 U.S.C. APP.) SECTION 5(b)

The Committee finds that the legislation does not establish or authorize establishment of an advisory committee within the definition of 5 U.S.C. App., Section 5(b).

XIII. CHANGES IN EXISTING LAW MADE
BY THE BILL, AS REPORTED

In compliance with clause 3 of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, changes in existing law made by the bill, as reported, are shown as follows (existing law proposed to be omitted is enclosed in black brackets, new matter is printed in italic, existing law in which no change is proposed is shown in roman):

CHANGES IN EXISTING LAW MADE BY THE BILL,
AS REPORTED

In compliance with clause 3 of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, changes in existing law made by the bill, as reported, are shown as follows (existing law proposed to be omitted is enclosed in black brackets, new matter is printed in italics, existing law in which no change is proposed is shown in roman):

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CONVENTION
CENTER AND SPORTS ARENA AUTHORIZATION ACT OF 1995

* * * * *

TITLE I—CONVENTION CENTER

SEC. 101. PERMITTING WASHINGTON CONVENTION CENTER AUTHORITY TO EXPEND REVENUES FOR CONVENTION CENTER ACTIVITIES.

[(a) PERMITTING EXPENDITURE WITHOUT APPROPRIATION.—The fourth sentence of section 446 of the District of Columbia Self-Government and Governmental Reorganization Act (sec. 47-304, D.C. Code) shall not apply with respect to any revenues of the District of Columbia which are attributable to the enactment of title III of the Washington Convention Center Authority Act of 1994 (D.C. Law 10-188) and which are obligated or expended for the activities described in subsection (b).]

[(b) ACTIVITIES DESCRIBED.—The activities described in this paragraph are—

[(1) the operation and maintenance of the existing Washington Convention Center; and

[(2) preconstruction activities with respect to a new convention center in the District of Columbia, including land acquisition and the conducting of environmental impact studies, architecture and design studies, surveys, and site acquisition.]]

[The fourth sentence of section 446 of the District of Columbia Home Rule Act (DC Code, sec. 47-304) shall not apply with respect to the expenditure or obligation of any revenues of the Washington Convention Center Authority for any purpose authorized under the Washington Convention Center Authority Act of 1994 (D.C. Law 10-188).]

* * * * *

UNITED STATES NAVAL NUCLEAR
PROPULSION PROGRAM CELEBRATES 50 YEARS

HON. GERALD B.H. SOLOMON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 3, 1998

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to recognize a significant milestone this August—the 50th anniversary of the establishment of the United States Naval Nuclear Propulsion Program. Since its inception, this program has steadfastly demonstrated the advantages to our Nation inherent in the safe, responsible

application of nuclear energy. This program's accomplishments have left an indelible imprint on our Nation's military, geopolitical, and industrial landscapes.

Development of nuclear propulsion plant for military application was the work of a team of Navy, government, and civilian personnel led by Admiral Hyman G. Rickover. Starting completely from scratch in 1948, then-Captain Rickover obtained Congressional support to develop an industrial base in new technology, pioneer new materials, design, build, and operate a prototype reactor, establish a training program, and deliver to our Nation a nuclear-powered submarine, heralding the first true subsurface. Within eight years, the U.S.S. *Nautilus*, broadcast her historic message "Underway on nuclear power." From that moment, our maritime military capability was dramatically revolutionized.

The use of nuclear power in our submarines and surface ships played a fundamental role in shaping our Cold War military posture. Starting with the "Forty-one for Freedom", our nuclear-powered ballistic missile submarines, with their virtual undetectability, became recognized as the most invulnerable component of the strategic triad. The *Nautilus*, in becoming the first ship to reach the North Pole, demonstrated the unlimited endurance of our nuclear-powered attack submarines and their ability to traverse the seas virtually anywhere on the planet. When the U.S.S. *Enterprise* became the first nuclear-powered aircraft carrier, our Navy made further strides in being able to rapidly project power to forward positions around the globe with minimal logistic constraints.

While these developments were vital in demonstrating to the world community the United States' resolve to protect democracy from the advances of communism, the mission of the Naval Nuclear Propulsion Program remains equally crucial in today's post Cold War era. In light of growing global uncertainty and greatly reduced number of overseas U.S. bases, the need to be able to rapidly project force is more prevalent today than ever. The demands on our Navy/Marine Corps teams are sizable as we confront this reality, but the Naval Nuclear Propulsion Program remains at the forefront of developing innovative technologies capable of surpassing any advances made by potential adversaries. Introduction of the *Seawolf*-Class submarine and the future New Attack Submarine ensures the Naval capability developed over the last fifty years will continue to prevail for decades to come.

At the same time, there is more to this fine program than what we observe in today's Navy. The Program developed the first full-scale atomic power plant designed solely for the production of electricity—an effort which became a prototype for the majority of today's commercial nuclear power stations. The Program developed a nuclear-powered, deep-submergence research and ocean engineering vehicle which not only has provided the Navy a valuable asset, but has been of benefit to other government agencies as well as research and educational institutions. Thousands of individuals have participated in this successful program, and the training and skills these people have acquired have made invaluable contributions to our Nation's industrial base.

Fifty years is a long time for any organization to flourish, let alone a government entity,

but while the Naval Nuclear Propulsion Program has grown in size over the years, its basic organization, responsibilities, standards, and technical discipline have remained unchanged. As a result of this consistency in approach toward safeguarding an unforgiving technology, the Program has achieved a safety and performance record internationally recognized as second to none. After over 113 million miles steamed on nuclear power, there has never been a reactor accident nor has there been any release of radioactivity resulting in significant environmental impact. The fact that our nuclear-powered warships operate internationally, visiting numerous foreign countries and territories is testament to the confidence bestowed on the Naval Nuclear Propulsion Program not only by our Nation, but by nations worldwide.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to note the accomplishments of the Naval Nuclear Propulsion Program over the past 50 years, and take particular pride in knowing the citizens of New York's 22nd District have played a tremendous role in the Program's success. At a time when we are reevaluating the role of government in our society, and are focusing our efforts on streamlining federal organizations, we must proudly recognize an organization that has stood the test of time without compromising quality or losing its sense of mission. I urge my colleagues to ensure these virtues are preserved through continued support for the unique structure and operating philosophy that has shaped this program's unwavering standard of excellence.

We extend our deepest gratitude to the dedicated men and women of the Naval Nuclear Propulsion Program who have forged its impeccable track record over the past fifty years, and wish the Program continuing success long into the future.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JOHN E. ENSIGN

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 3, 1998

Mr. ENSIGN. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, July 31, 1998, I was unavoidably detained in traffic and missed rollcall vote No. 367.

FRESNO CITY COUNCIL'S UNANIMOUS SUPPORT FOR PROTECTING THE UNITED STATES FLAG

HON. GEORGE P. RADANOVICH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 3, 1998

Mr. RADANOVICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to report that on June 23, 1998, the Fresno City Council unanimously passed a resolution in support of H.J. Resolution 54 prohibiting the desecration of the United States flag.

The Fresno City Council represents over half a million residents of the City of Fresno. The Council took this action because of their firm support of the symbolic nature of our flag. Our flag is more than cotton or nylon, it represents our nation's spirit of freedom and independence, and therefore merits the proper